

Kiers, Roger

From: neonbob@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2011 9:13 PM
To: Sandra L NWS Manning
Cc: Kiers, Roger; Matthew Sterner; Chris Moore; Kitty Henderson
Subject: Re: McMillin Bridge (UNCLASSIFIED)

Dear Sandra,

Thank you for your response to my message of May 2, 2011. I feel somewhat uncomfortable with the necessity of material being identified as "CLASSIFIED" and "UNCLASSIFIED". This suggests a lack of transparency in the Section 106 Process. It would seem that the consulting parties should have the privilege of knowing what is being discussed between the Corps and WSDOT, with the understanding that the Parties would have to withhold comments until formally requested by the Corps. I cannot anticipate how the other Parties, Agencies, and Tribes may feel about this censorship. However, please be assured that I personally believe that any actions taken by the Corps will not restrict the subsequent consideration of alternatives to avoid, minimize or mitigate the undertaking's of any adverse effects on the historic properties of the McMillin Bridge. I encourage others to offer their feelings on this issue.

A special note to Roger Kiers: I want to assure you that all of my correspondence is always considered unclassified and open to the public. Since Sandra's message is listed as UNCLASSIFIED I urge you to please distribute this communication to the usual Parties and Agencies and post on the ftp site. Should WSDOT restrict you from performing this service, please advise me immediately so I can take appropriate action. Perhaps there may be a need to restructure the relationship of WSDOT with the Parties.

Your expeditious handling would be appreciated.

Thank you, Sandra and Roger for your cooperation and efforts.

Bob Krier

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sandra L NWS Manning" <Sandra.L.Manning@usace.army.mil>
To: neonbob@comcast.net, "Jeff Sawyer" <SawyerJ@wsdot.wa.gov>
Cc: "Roger Kiers" <kiersro@wsdot.wa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2011 2:03:32 PM
Subject: RE: McMillin Bridge (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Thank you for your inquiry. I have been in regular discussions with WSDOT about the Section 106 requirements. They are currently working on a revised alternatives analysis per our request. I anticipate receiving that soon.

We have had a request from the National Trust to review this information and to discuss this in a meeting, so that will be organized as soon as we get the response, you will be notified of the meeting when we get closer. We have also requested that WSDOT provided a responsiveness summary as an addendum to, or included in the alternatives analysis that will provide a response to all of the issues, concerns and questions raised by the consulting parties.

As per your status request for the particular WSDOT responses, I cannot answer those for WSDOT, but will copy this e-mail to Jeff Sawyer who is the Environmental Manager for the Olympic Region.

If you have any more questions, please let me know.

-----Original Message-----

From: neonbob@comcast.net [<mailto:neonbob@comcast.net>]

Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 9:54 AM

To: Manning, Sandra L NWS

Cc: Roger Kiers

Subject: McMillin Bridge

Dear Sandra:

May I impose upon you to give me a brief status report of the Section 106 Process for the subject bridge? I, suppose, to comply with proper protocol, I should be requesting this information from WSDOT. However, my latest communications to WSDOT have not resulted in responses that I believe are in conformance with the provisions of Paragraph 800.11, namely "...sufficient documentation to enable any reviewing parties to understand its basis."

I have not received any acknowledgment from Paula Hammond that she actually received my letter to her of December 06, 2010. In Mr. Kevin Dayton's letter to me dated, December 22, 2010, (a cc was supposedly sent to Mr. Jenkins) he made reference to that letter but his response certainly didn't provide adequate documentation to comply with the provisions of Section 106. I replied to his letter with my response dated, January 04, 2011, but have not received a reply, and frankly, I don't anticipate one. My communications are posted on the FTP site.

I have been continually searching the FTP site for a reply from WSDOT to the Corps' letter dated, December 08, 2010, but have not found any such response. Please advise whether WSDOT has replied and furnish a copy of the response and any additional responses from the Corps.

I would appreciate any help you can furnish me with regard to recent correspondence and documentation so I can anticipate my next commitment to the process.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Krier

Note to Roger Kiers: Please provide your usual distribution to the Parties and post on the FTP site.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE